

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION

ERIK GARCIA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.	)	
	)	FILE No.
FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW, ERIK GARCIA, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendants’ failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

**PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff ERIK GARCIA (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Houston, Texas (Harris County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking and standing.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. Plaintiff is also an independent advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of enforcing Plaintiff’s civil rights, monitoring, determining and ensuring whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. His motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others; and pledges to do whatever is necessary to create the requisite standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this property, including returning to the Property as soon as it is accessible (“Advocacy Purposes”).

7. Defendant, FERUZA BEGUM (hereinafter “FERUZA BEGUM”), is an individual who transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

8. Defendant, FERUZA BEGUM, may be properly served with process via service, to wit: 4154 Amir Street, Houston, TX 77072-1345.

9. Defendant, MOHAMMED S. KHAN (hereinafter “MOHAMMED S. KHAN”), is an individual who transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

10. Defendant, MOHAMMED S. KHAN, may be properly served with process via service, to wit: 4154 Amir Street, Houston, TX 77072-1345

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

11. On or about February 27, 2020, Plaintiff was a customer at “SNS Food Store” a business located at 125 E. Edgebrook Drive, Houston, TX 77034, referenced herein as “SNS Food Store”. *See* Receipt of purchase by Plaintiff attached as Exhibit 1. *See* also, photograph of Plaintiff at SNS Food Store attached as Exhibit 2.

12. On or about May 11, 2020, Plaintiff revisited SNS Food Store as a customer. Attached is a receipt documenting Plaintiff’s purchase. *See* Exhibit 3. Also attached is a photograph documenting Plaintiff’s visit to the Property. *See* Exhibit 4

13. Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN are the owners or co-owners of the real property and improvements that SNS Food Store is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

14. Plaintiff lives 10 miles from the Property.

15. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located at 125 E. Edgebrook Drive, Houston, TX 77034, Harris County Property Appraiser’s account number 0432170000051 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, are compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

16. Plaintiff has visited the Property at least once before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property within six months after the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and the Property is accessible again. The

purpose of the revisit is to be a return customer, to determine if and when the Property is made accessible and to maintain standing for this lawsuit for Advocacy Purposes.

17. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property to purchase goods and/or services as a return customer living in the near vicinity as well as for Advocacy Purposes, but does not intend to re-expose himself to the ongoing barriers to access and engage in a futile gesture of visiting the public accommodation known to Plaintiff to have numerous and continuing barriers to access.

18. Plaintiff travelled to the Property as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, encountered the barriers to access at the Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged those barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the the Property.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG**

19. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

20. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of

discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and

- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

21. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

\* \* \* \* \*

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

22. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

23. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

24. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

25. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the

Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

26. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

27. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

28. According to 42 U.S. Code § 12182 as Defendants own the subject property upon which this claim is based, they have failed to insure that no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation, both on the exterior of the Property and the interior public spaces of the Property.

29. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Property in his capacity as a customer at the Property as well as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

30. Plaintiff intends to visit the Property again in the very near future as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his

access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

31. Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, have discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

32. Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, are compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

33. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed, or was made aware of prior to the filing of this Complaint, that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Property include, but are not limited to:

**ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:**

- (i) The accessible parking space is missing a proper identification sign in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

- (ii) Accessible parking space has a slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and is not level. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (iii) The access aisle to the accessible parking space has a slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and is not level. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (iv) The access aisle to the accessible parking space is also not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (v) The accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of Section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.
- (vi) The Property has an accessible ramp that lacks finished edges or edge protection and/or is otherwise in violation of Section 405.9 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (vii) The total number of accessible parking spaces is inadequate and is in violation of Section 208.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. There are a total of approximately 76 parking spaces on this Property, requiring a minimum of four accessible



parking spaces, however there is only one accessible parking space on the Property. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

- (viii) The interior of Unit 125A has walking surfaces lacking a 36 (thirty-six) inch clear width, due to a policy of placing items in the accessible route and maximizing product placement, in violation of Section 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to properly utilize public features at the Property.
- (ix) The interior of Unit 125A has walking surfaces leading to the restroom lacking a 36 (thirty-six) inch clear width, in violation of Section 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to properly utilize public features at the Property.
- (x) Defendant fails to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

#### **RESTROOMS IN UNIT 125A**

- (i) The door to the restrooms has a maximum clear width below 32 (thirty-two) inches in violation of Section 404.2.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- (ii) The restrooms lack proper door hardware in violation of Section 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to utilize the restroom facilities.

- (iii) The restroom lacks signage in compliance with Sections 216.8 and 703 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to locate accessible restroom facilities.
- (iv) The controls on the faucets require pinching and turning of the wrists in violation of Section 309.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to utilize the restroom facilities.
- (v) The lavatories and/or sinks in the restrooms have exposed pipes and surfaces and are not insulated or configured to protect against contact in violation of Section 606.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- (vi) The restrooms lack adequate turning space in violation of Sections 304.3.1 and 304.3.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- (vii) The grab bars/handrails adjacent to the commode are missing and violate Section 604.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- (viii) The door exiting the restroom lacks a proper minimum maneuvering clearance, due to the proximity of the door hardware to the adjacent sink, in violation of Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

- (ix) Restrooms have fixtures with inadequate clear floor space in violation of Sections 606.2, 603.2 and 604.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

34. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Property.

35. Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Property in violation of the ADA.

36. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

37. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to the Property into compliance with the ADA.

38. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

39. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications as the market value of the Property is listed on the Property Appraiser website at \$628,779.00.

40. Upon information and good faith belief, the Property have been altered since 2010.

41. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

42. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, are required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those alleged herein.

43. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

44. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN.

45. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

46. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, to modify the Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Defendant, FERUZA BEGUM, in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court find Defendant, MOHAMMED S. KHAN, in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;

- (c) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (d) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendants, FERUZA BEGUM and MOHAMMED S. KHAN, to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the subject Property to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (e) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (f) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: June 3, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas S. Schapiro

Douglas S. Schapiro, Esq.

*Attorney-in-Charge for Plaintiff*

Southern District of Texas ID No. 3182479

The Schapiro Law Group, P.L

7301-A W. Palmetto Park Rd., #100A

Boca Raton, FL 33433

Tel: (561) 807-7388

Email: [schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com](mailto:schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com)